clock. **The Vice-Chairman, Shri B. Satyanarayan Reddy,** in the Chair.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GENERAL) 1988-89

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF EXPENDITURE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. K. GADHVI): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for the year 1988-89 (August, 1988).

I. STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING DISAPPROVAL OF THE RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS (PREVENTION OF MISUSE) ORDINANCE, 1988

II. RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS (PREVENTION OF MISUSE) BILL, 1988

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I move:

> "That this House disapproves of of the Religious Institutions (Prevention of Misuse) Ordinance, 1988, (No. 3 of 1988 promulgated by the President on the 26th May, 1988."

Sir, I had on the previous occasion mentioned that of the six ordinance issued in the period of fortyfive intersession days averaging an ordinance a week, a traid of ordinances related to the State of Punjab and in that traid possibly the most difficult ordinance to accept is this one; which has a wider implication, and which in itself is the most abject admission of the failure of the Government, in its primary responsibilities, is this particular Ordinance for preventing the misuse of religious institutions. I have a primary difficulty, a principal difficulty, which has to be stated at the very outset and it has to be repeated and repeated over and over again, as I will do now, that the fact that a Government, our Government, has found it necessary to bring about an Ordinance specifically mentioning the aspect of prohibiting the use or misuse of religious places is in itself an abject admission of failure and I will just now explain this. Now, Sir, my difficulties can be categorised under those that are explicit, those that are procedural and those that are implicit difficulties.

Before I come to the explicit difficulties, a fact and a principle need to be stated at the very outset. India is not a theocratic State. The concept of a theocratic State is alien to our very swabhava, to the nature of the Indian psyche, to our dharma which does not recognise distinction between the colourings of faith. And if India is not a theocratic State and does not subscribe to theocracy, then any legislation, any interference, any attempt by the Government to define which is religious and which is not religious is bound to create difficulties and is bound to open a Pandora's box, and if you combine that with the proven and admitted incapacity of our Government, and the proven failures of this Government, then, of course, our difficulties are also multiplied.

Sir, from the Statement of Objects and Reasons which the Bill has, certain portions merit repetition. The Government has come forward with this piece of Ordinance, and has followed it up with legislation which explain itself by suggesting that the question of the misuse of the religious institutions for political and other purposes has been engaging the attention of the Government for some time. As I started by saying, the opening sentence of the Statement of Objects and Reasons is an explicit and the most abject admission of the failure of our Government in its primary responsibilities. It then specifies the context of this piece of legislation, and it mentions certain incidents in